AN ANSWER TO Dr. Stillingfleet's Book OF THE Unreasonableness OF SEPARATION,

So far as it Concerns the

Peaceable Designe.

With Some

Animadversions upon the Debate between **Him**, and Mr. **Baxter**, concerning the *National-Church*, and the **Head** of it.

Against whom hast thou Exalted thy Voice, and Lifted up thine Eyes on High? Isai. 37. 23.

LONDON,

Printed for **Thomas Parkhurst**, at the *Three Bibles* in *Cheapside*, near *Mercers*-Chappel.

2206

AN ANSWER TO Dr. Stillingfleet, &c.

IN Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Book, there is one thing I meet with, that I perhaps can better tell how, than another, to Anſwer. It is in his Preface, where he is going about to make the Non-conformiſts a kind of Parties with the Papiſts, as if they were joyning with them for the bringing in of Popery; and for the proof of this, he produces one Evidence. I will ſet down his own words, and Anſwer the Allegation.

"In *Ann. Dom.* 1675. there was a Book printed, En-
"tituled, *The Peaceable deſigne, or an Account of the Non-*
"*conformiſts Meetings, by ſome Miniſters of London.* In it,
"an Objection is thus put: *But what ſhall we ſay then to*
"*the Papiſts?* His Anſwer is, *The Papiſt, in our Account,*

" *is but one ſort of Recuſants, & the Conſcientious & Peace-*
" *able among them, muſt be held in the ſame Predicament with*
" *thoſe among our ſelves, that likewiſe refuſe to come to Common-*
" *Prayer.* What is this but Joyning for a Toleration
" of Popery ? If this be not plain enough, theſe words
" follow ; *But as for the Common-Papiſt, who lives Inno-*
" *cently in his way, he is to Us as other Separatiſts ; and ſo*
" *he comes under the like Toleration.*

" This notable Book, with ſome few Additions &
" Alterations, hath been ſince Printed, & with great
" ſincerity called, *An Anſwer to my Sermon.* And the
" Times being Changed ſince, the former paſſage is
" thus Altered : *The Papiſts is one whoſe Worſhip to Us is*
" *Idolatry, and we cannot therefore allow them the Liberty of*
" *Publick Aſſembling themſelves as others of the Separation.*
" Is it Idolatry, and not to be Tolerated in 1680 ?
" And was it Idolatry, & to be Tolerated in 1675 ?
" Or, Was it no Idolatry then, but is become ſo now,
" and intolerable Idolatry too ? The latter paſſage
" hath theſe Alterations; Inſtead of *He is to Us as other*
" *Separatiſts, and ſo comes under the like Toleration*, Theſe
" are put in, *He is to Us (in regard of what he doth in pri-*
" *vate, in the matter of his God) as others who refuſe to come*
" *to Common-Prayer.* Now we ſee Toleration ſtruck
" out for the Papiſts, but it was not only viſible e-
" nough before, but that very book was Printed with
" a deſign to preſent it to the Parliament, which was

" the

" the higheſt way of owning their Concurrence with " the Papiſts for a general Toleration: And the true " Reaſon of this Alteration is, that Then was Then, " and Now is Now.

For the Anſwering this Evidence. In the firſt place, this Book the Doctor mentions, was drawn up by *One* man (though put out by *Others*) and the firſt Miſtake of the Doctor is, to lay a Charge on the *Party* of the Nonconformiſts, for a paſſage which indeed concerns but *One perſon* only.

In the next place, the Reaſon of bringing that paſſage into the Book was, becauſe the *Objection* is ſo Obvious it could not be *Baulkt*; and the Conſequence appearing to the Author Undeniable, he thought it but *Honeſt* to yeild it. The Doctor then is miſtaken next, that believes (or pretends) the Reaſon of the bringing in that paſſage, was on purpoſe only to Favour, or fall In with the Papiſts. That which is ſaid in *Right* to *All*, ought not to be interpreted in *Favour* to *Any*.

In the Third place, for the Alteration mentioned, it is to be known, that when the Author had drew up this Book, he left it with a Non-conformiſt Doctor to ſhew it to his Brethren; who return'd it after a while, telling him, That they Diſliked ſome paſſages in it; which made him put it into ſome other hands, who afterwards, while he was Abſent, prin-

ted it. They altered nothing, but when it came out, the Author indeed found his Brethren Offended at ſome things, and that paſſage moſt obnoxious to Exception: ſo that he preſenrly made his Emendations, and ſeeing the Book ill Printed, intended in time to have another Impreſſion. Upon this, it appears the Doctor is again Miſtaken, in regard to this Alteration which he Quotes, who judges the Reaſon of the Change, to be only becauſe of the Times. *The True Reaſon* (ſayes he) *is, becauſe Then was Then, and Now is Now.* The *True Reaſon*, as if he knew it, when you ſee how perfectly he is out in his Confidence, as well as his Conjectures. The making the Emendations which he did, at the preſent Seaſon, is a Demonſtration. The Nonconformiſts are here Suſpected or Impeached by this Doctor, for *Favouring & Joyning* with the *Papiſts*, becauſe of a *paſſage* in that Book; when the very Reaſon of *Altering* that *paſſage* was, becauſe of their preſumed *Finding Fault* with it.

In the Laſt place, we have here, not only a *Miſtake* in the Doctor (which might be born) but an open *Wrong* or *Injury*, if it be not want of Conſideration. The Doctor Thinks, or Speaks, as if the Author (in *Re-printing* the Book) had Changed his Opinion; wherein I count he moſt of all is Out, and moſt to Blame. He who drew up the Book, is not one of that Humour, as to Turn with the Times, but rather

ther againſt them. The Opinion he offered in the Year 75, is the ſame with what he holds now in the Year 80. Here is an Alteration indeed as to *more Words*, or ſome *other* words, but the *ſame Opinion* or Solution, with the Difference only of a farther *Explication* of it, and nothing elſe therein (beſides avoiding offence) entended. The Author had been wary in declaring the *Toleration* he propoſed to be a *Limited* one, and provided againſt the *Jeſuite* upon reaſon of *State*, and ſhewed his dread of *Popery* in *Dominion*, but had omitted the diſtinction of a toleration in regard to *Publick* Aſſemblies, and the *Private* exerciſe of a Man's own Religion. He explains himſelf therefore by way of ſupply, ſignifying that what he ſaid at firſt, ſhould be taken in regard to the tolerating the *Papiſt* only privately, as his meaning really was then, and is now but fullier expreſſed. This is the *Opinion* he recedes not from (whether *peculiar* to himſelf or not) that *No Man ſhould be perſecuted meerly for his Conſcience, if there be no other Reaſon.* Whether a Man be a *Diſſenter* of *one* kind, or of *another*, *The Common Rule of Chriſtianty muſt be remembred* (he ſayes) *ſtill, that we do to all Men, as we would be done by, and that with what Meaſure we mete to others, it ſhall be met to us again.* Theſe Words remain in all the Impreſſions.

And now for the *Title*, I have this alſo to Anſwer.

ſwer. The Book as it came out *An.* 75. was then gone, and now Re-printed againſt the Parliament Sate; but they not Sitting, was laid by till the Doctor's Sermon comming out, it was thought *Seaſonable*. The Doctor Charges the *Nonconformiſts* Meetings with Schiſme. This Book gives an account of their Meetings, and Vindicates them from Schiſme: and foraſmuch, as ſomething was Inſerted in regard to the *People* (whom his Charge mainly concerns) when the *Miniſters* only were Vindicated in the Firſt Edition, and the firſt Sheet was new Printed over on purpoſe, and the Doctor named, it was ſent out with *this alſo* in the *Title*. There was no Concealment that it was a former Book, it was ſtill call'd *The Peaceable Deſign*, and ſaid to be *Renewed*; but there was this Addition, and this Reaſon. And ſo I have given an Account of Doctor *Stillingfleet's* Book, ſo far as concerns that Author; and do not doubt, but the Doctor will have an Account alſo from others ſo far as it concerns them, in due Seaſon. As Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Alſop*, Dr. *Owen*.

And here I had thought to have given over, and got one of theſe Friends to have put ſo much for me in one of their Books: but when I remember there is a *Poſtſcript* to the laſt Impreſſion of the Book mentioned, and what there is ſaid, and with

with what openneſs; I muſt needs ſay, that I did expect ſomething from a Candid perſon, more like a Gentleman; that is, ſo much Ingenuity as to cover a Fault which was confeſſed, rather than expoſe it, if there were any: but I ſee there is nothing of this Nature, no ſuch Ingenuity I thought, to be expected from the Doctor.

I am ſenſible of his Spirit, and that temper I obſerve in him, from a few Words let out of his Soul here and there, in this Ironical Way of his, which is a ſufficient Indication of what kind of Eſtimation he hath of himſelf, in his contempt of others. I will give one inſtance in a place ſomewhere, where he is ſpeaking of Mr. *Alſop*. He begins his Sentence, *This Learned Man*, but before he ends it, he tells us of an *Admirable Peice of his Reading*: ſo that when I was thinking him to be in earneſt, I find it only to diſdain him. I do therefore hate ſuch a counterfeit Epithet as this is, and theſe fleering Expreſſions. It is all one in good earneſt, as if he ſhould more at large ſpeak thus to his Readers. Readers, you may perhaps think that Mr. *Alſop* is a Learned Man; but alaſs, What is he in compariſon of me? I am the Man that have all Learning in me. 'Tis I have done ſuch Feats, eſpecially againſt the *Papiſts*. I am the Man that have Kill'd the *Philiſtine*.

I forbear to mention a place where he Treats this ſame Worthy Man, after the rate, as if he were ſome Perſon diſtraught, which is a vile Abuſe, but that is not the thing I Note.

Another Inſtance I muſt not forbear, in regard to Mr. *Baxter*, and it is this, That when he at firſt names that Good Man, he tells us he *Pities* him. Mr. *Baxter* belike, is one ſcarce worthy of the Doctors *Conqueſt*, but fit for his *Compaſſion*. And can the Doctor here be in good earneſt? Mr. *Baxter* certainly is not an Enemy ſo Contemptible, nor the Doctor I hope quite ſo *Elated*, as he is *Idle*. The Doctor is one who may look on himſelf to have Abilities in ſome regard, which Mr. *Baxter* hath not; but if he ſhould really value himſelf with Mr. *Baxter*, upon the account of a *Profound Divine* (which one may think here he would be at), he is a Man who muſt want that Modeſty in *good Earneſt*, whereof he makes a *Shew* in the Beginning of his Book, upon a Compariſon of his with *Jewel*.

The Doctor hath Learning, and hath apt Words, and is a ready ſufficient Man: but Mr. *Baxter* is really a Man Extraordinary, and whoſe Talents are of another ſort, than the Doctors can reach unto. Mr. *Baxter* is one, I will ſay, like the Man in the Neighbourhood, who

who is firſt up, and all the Neighbours come for Fire to his Houſe: that is, one from whom the preſent Age do fetch *Light*, and unto whom the Ages to come will bring *Honour*. Neither care I for any Bodies ſaying this is *Odious*, for the *Old-Proverb* ſhall not hinder me to end the Compariſon. The *Doctor* is one as well as others who may be willing to *Learn* (or elſe I am ſure he will have the more need to be *Taught*) of that Man whom he *Pitties*.

It is fit after I have ſaid this, that I make it good. And there is a Diſpute between theſe Two, concerning the National Church, will help me to do it. If there be a National Church, it muſt have a Head, a *Conſtitutive-Head*, ſayes Mr. *Baxter*: and therefore asks the *Doctor* where the *Conſtitutive Regent part* of the Church of *Eng-* is to be placed? It is a matter of *Poluy* the *Doctor* is put upon: The *Queſtion* alſo ſeems ſomething *Perplext*, it may be on purpoſe to try the *Doctor*, but this we find, the *Doctor* is poſed, that is flat, for he cannot Anſwer, but is driven to ſay there is no ſuch Head, and that there is no need of any; which is the Abſurdity unto which the Opponent would drive him. If ever any Boy in the higher Form at School, was poſed by his Maſter, the *Doctor* here is poſed, who is in-

deed in Mr. *Baxter's* Hands, no other but ſuch a one, when he takes him on ſuch a point, where his Books, and Polite Style do not ſerve him.

That there is a Government in the Church of *England*, I hope the *Doctor* does not doubt, who pleads for Conformity to it. Where there is a Government eſtabliſhed, there muſt be a Political Society; Every Political Body conſiſts of a *Pars Imperans & ſubdita.* Does, or does not the *Doctor* know this? If the Church of *England* then be a Political Church, it muſt have a Regent part, and this *Conſtitutive Regent part* muſt be Aſſigned.

The *Doctor* here is indeed ſomething more Unfortunate in his Reading, than he uſes, or elſe it need not be ſo hard for any, to find out, where the Head, or Regent part of every Political Society is, or muſt be placed, whether Mr. *Baxter* contradicts it or not. There are therefore certain *Rights of Soveraignty, Jura Magiſtatis* (as Writers of Politicks do call them) or *Prerogatives*, and where thoſe *Rights* are inveſted, there the *Headſhip* muſt be placed. The chief of theſe *Rights* is *Legiſlation.* Whereſoever then the Power of giving Laws to any Society is found, there muſt this *Conſtitutive Regent part*, which Mr. *Baxter* enquires for, be Aſſigned. The Church of *England*, now we

we know, hath Her Laws: There are Laws *Eccleſiaſtical*, and theſe are called *Canons*, or *Conſtitutions*. We muſt then enquire where it is, the Power of Making *theſe* does lye. And here we find, that the *Arch-Biſhop* of the *Province*, with the *Biſhops* and *Clerks* making up a *Convocation*, do frame theſe *Canons*.

If the *Doctor* now could but prove, That the Hierarchy of the Church thus Congregated, were certainly of Divine Inſtitution, ſo that there needed no other Authority, but of the *Convocation* only, for their Ratification; then could he perfectly aſſign to us ſuch a Head as Mr. *Baxter* ſeeks. But foraſmuch as there is no Authority in the *Convocation* when they have Compoſed their *Canons*, to Impoſe any of them upon the Church, or to oblige the Conſcience of any by them, until they are ratifyed by the Authority of the King; it is manifeſt both that this Hierarchy of the Nation is but of Human Right, and that the King alone (the Power of Legiſlation, which proves it, lying only in him) is, and muſt be, the Head of the Church, in this Kingdom.

And that this certainly is ſo, it is declared in the Statute of *Henry the Eighth*, That the *King ſhall be taken for the only Supream Head of the Church*, called *Eccleſia Anglicana*. To underſtand this, The

Church may be consid'red, we are to know, as *Universal*, and so is *Christ* the Head of it, and can only give Laws to it: Or as *Particular*, and so the Pastors are Heads, and Rule it: Or as *National*, (to wit, as it is according to the Statute *Ecclesia Anglicana*) and so the Magistrate is Head, and makes Laws for it.

I will add; There is something *Essential* to the Church of *Christ*, and something *Accidental*. That there should be Persons, who Meet to Worship *God* and *Christ*, and be put in Order for it, is of *Christ*'s Appointment, and Necessary to his Church. Of these *Particular* Persons and Churches, the *Catholick* Church consists. To be *Particular* then, or *Universal*, is of *Essential* Consideration to *Christ*'s Church: But to be *National*, is of *Accidental* Consideration. That all the People of a Land should be Christian, and the Magistrate also, is (I say) an Accidental thing to the Church, which may Exist where that is not: Upon which account, though the Magistrate be none of *Christ*'s proper Officers, yet may he be Head of his Church, and Constitutive Head of it, as under his Dominions, because he is Head not in any *Essential*, but in this *Accidental* Consideration of it.

I will now set down the *Doctor*'s own Words. Pag. 301. *We deny any Necessity of any such Constitutive Regent*

gent Part, or one Formal Eccleſiaſtical Head, as Eſſential to a National-Church. For a National-Conſent is as ſufficient to make a National-Church, as an Univerſal-Conſent to make a Catholick-Church. In this Determination of the Point, when the *Doctor* denyes any Neceſſity of ſuch a Head, I hope, he is not ſo frivolous, as to believe One in this Nation, and not to tell it. So long as the Church of *England* is a Political Church, and hath a Government eſtabliſh't, it muſt have its *Regent* Part, as well as the Part *Ruled*; and to deny the Neceſſity of *One*, is all one as to ſay there is *None*.

I preſs the *Doctor*: Is it a Political-Church, or no? If it be, he muſt find it a Head: If it be not, then it is only a Community of Chriſtians, amongſt whom, it muſt be ſuppoſed, there is no Government (as yet) introduced; and then ſhall our Eccleſiaſtical Laws, Canons, and Conſtitutions, our Biſhops and Arch-Biſhops, with the whole Conſtitution we have already, be hurled in the Duſt. The *Doctor* will be a fine Champion for the Church, if he perſiſts to ſay this.

We deny any Neceſſity of any ſuch Conſtitutive Regent Part, or one Formal Eccleſiaſtical Head, as Eſſential to a National-Church. The *Doctor* here, who is *poſed* with the *Queſtion*, is *confounded* with the *Terms*. He ſhould diſtinguiſh between a *Head*, and a *Formal*

Eccle-

Eccleſiaſtical Head; a *Regent Part*, and an *Eccleſiaſtical Regent Part*; a *Conſtitutive Regent Part*, and a *Formal Eccleſiaſtical Head* of the Church of *England*. Though a *National*-Church hath no *Eccleſiaſtical* Head, it hath a *Head*, a *Regent Part*, a *Conſtitutive Regent Part*, under this *Accidental* Conſideration of the Church as *National*, though not under the *Eſſential* Conſideration of it as the *Church of Chriſt*.

If the *Doctor* had light upon it in ſome of his Books, that the King of *England* repreſents Two Perſons, an *Eccleſiaſtical* Perſon while He preſides by His Authority in the *Convocation*, and ſo is Head of the *Church*; and a *Civil* Perſon, while He ſits with the *Parliament*, and ſo is Head of the *State*, and upon the account of both, the Fountain of all Obligation upon the Subject, both from the *Canons* of the Church, and *Statutes* of the Realm, I cannot tell how he might have put Mr. *Baxter* to it: But ſo long as the *King* is not indeed both Supream Magiſtrate, and High-Prieſt, as the *Maccabees* were, and neither of them think otherwiſe of the King, than Magiſtrate only, (that is, Supream Coercive Governour) it is this which is here ſaid, muſt be the Expedient to remove the Bone from between them.

It is ſaid in Scripture, That *Kings* and *Queens* ſhall be *Nurſing-Fathers* and *Nurſing-Mothers* to the Church,

Church. As they are *Fathers*, they are *Heads*: As *Nurſing-Fathers*, it ſhews their Power is not *Internal* to the Church, but *External*, as Divines ſpeak, that is of another kind than that which is proper to Spiritual Fathers, the Paſtors, or *Chriſt*'s own Officers. The Authority of Kings over the Church, is *Objective*, (they ſay, *Circa Sacra*) not *Formal*: That is, it is Objectively Eccleſiaſtical, and Formally Civil. And as this is ſo, I apprehend in like manner, that the Society of Chriſtians in a Nation (as the whole Nation are ſuch) is *Objectively* a *Church*, and *Formally* a *Kingdom*, or *Common-Wealth of Chriſtians*; and ſo may the Chriſtian Magiſtrate be the Conſtitutive Regent Part of it.

Well! But what Argument hath the *Doctor* to prove that there is no neceſſity for a National Church, to have a Conſtitutive Head, eſſential to it; that is eſſential to it, not as the Church of *Chriſt*; but under a National Conſideration? He hath no Argument, but brings another Inſtance, and that is of the *Catholick* Church viſible, which he ſaith, hath no Head neither. The *Doctor* is miſerably driven to the Wall, when he is driven hither. There was never any *Proteſtant* doubted, but that *Jeſus Chriſt* is the Head of the *Catholick* Church; and if he be the Head of it as *Univerſal*, he muſt be the Head of it,

whether *Visible* or *Invisible*. But *Christ is not* (sayes he) *a Visible Head*. Poor! If this were true, it is enough that he is the Head of those who are Visible: but yet he is out even in this, for though *Christ* be not *Caput Visum*, he is *Caput Visibile*. He is not seen on Earth, but he is seen in Heaven. Nay, he was seen on Earth by *Paul* and *Stephen*, and will Appear as he is at the Great Day.

And what thinks the *Doctor* of *Christ* before his Ascension; was he Head then? Nay, did not *Christ* while upon Earth give Laws for his Church, appoint Officers, and Commission his Apostles to gather Christian Societies in the World? And is not his Government over them, a Visible Ecclesiastical Government, where the Officers are Visible, and the Members Visible; aud is not he the Head then of the Church Visible? Are not making Laws, and Appointing Officers, the Rights of a Head?

When that Article was put in the *Creed*, *I Believe the Catholick Church*; I would ask the *Doctor*, Whether this Distinction of *Visible* and *Invisible* was used in the World? And if it was not, when it arose, it could not take off any thing of *Christ*'s Headship. When both Visible and Invisible were but one, he must be Head of both. Again, there are some Learned Men deny a *Catholick* Church Visible. The *Doctor* does hold it. And what if they should advance

vance againſt him this Argument? If there be no *Catholick* Viſible Head, there is no *Catholick* Church Viſible. But there is no *Catholick* Viſible Head. The *Minor* is the *Doctors*, and the *Major* is to be denyed of no other but the *Doctor*.

Let us proceed to the bottom. We have ſounded the *Doctors* Invention; let us try his Reaſon. *There is no neceſſity of ſuch a Head* (ſayes he) *for a National Conſent is as ſufficient to make a National Church, as an Univerſal Conſent to make a* Catholick *Church. This is the Doctors Reaſon.* It is Conſent alone makes a Church or Society, though it hath no Head. The Conſent of a *Nation* makes a *National* Church, the Conſent of *All Chriſtians* the *Catholick* Church, the Conſent of a *Particular Company*, a *Particular* Church or Congregation. This is his bottom, and it is ſomething, but exceeding rawly ſpoken.

Let us underſtand therefore, where there is a company of Perſons, who have no power one over another, that might receive mutual Advantage, if United to that end; ſuch a Company are called a *Community*. If they agree together for the obtainment of that end, to come into an Order of Superiority and Inferiority, that makes it a Society, or Political Body. If the end be for that good which is only *Temporal*, it is called a *Common-Wealth*: if for that which is *Spiritual*, it is a *Church*. The *Doctor* now is

to be askt, What Conſent it is that he means?

If he means by his Conſent, the Agreement which People make at firſt, when they enter into Society, it is true, that their Conſent is the Foundation: but the *Doctor* here I hope does ſee that this Conſent is for the having a Head, and Government, and the pitching upon the Sort, or Manner of the Government they would have; which Agreement is called the *Conſtitution*. It is not this Conſent therefore the *Doctor* ſhould mean, which is not alſo applicable to the *Catholick* Church (in which he Inſtances) whoſe Head and Government is not of Mans Election, but of the Will of *God* only.

By the way for the *National* Church, It is true, that Particular Churches in a Nation, being of Divine Appointment, the Paſtors or Miniſters who have the Rule over their Flocks *In Actu Primo*, that is, the *Right* of Diſcipline and Cenſure, may agree to a delegating that power *In Actu Secundo*, or the *Exerciſe* of it (for Reaſons of Prudence) to a Superintendent, called a *Biſhop*, who ſhall be Superviſed by an *Arch-Biſhop*; and that the *Arch-Biſhop*, *Biſhops*, and *Clerks*, choſen out of themſelves, met in a *Convocation*, ſhall have the Power of making Laws, or *Canons*, by which they will be Governed. Upon ſuch a Conſent, as this here appears a Political National Church in the *Conſtitution*, wherein is an

Ec-

Eccleſiaſtical Formal Conſtitutive Regent Part, or Head over an Organical Body for the *Adminiſtration*, and that founded upon the true Bottom, upon which all rightly conſtituted Societies do ſtand, the Agreement of the Community. The Regent Part here is placed not in *One Perſon* (which does not need) but in *One Corporation*, or United Aſſembly, whereof the Arch-Biſhop is but a chief part, as the Biſhops are: and I would humbly ask Mr. *Baxter* what he thinks of it. For as for the *Doctor*, I think not him a Competent Judge, not ſo much becauſe he is not verſed in that ſort of Study, as the other is; but becauſe of his departure from himſelf in the Prudentials of his *Irenicum*, and being thereby now engaged to maintain the Government of our Church to be of Divine Right, he muſt not receive this Notion, which, let it ſhew him never ſo clear and firm a Ground to build the ſame upon, does make it of *Human Inſtitution*.

If by his conſent, he means the conſent of every Man in particular, to be of ſuch a Church or Society, it is true that a Mans conſent does make him a Member, ſo as without it he could be none: but the Church or Society, muſt be ſuppoſed to be *Formed* before of the *Ruling*, and *Ruled* Part, and his Conſent to be a Member, is a conſent to be Ruled, and to own ſuch a *Head*, as well as to enjoy the *Be-*

nefits of ſuch a *Society*. This Conſent is the *Condition* upon which he hath right to be a Member, it is the *Ratio Fundandi* of his Memberſhip, and the *Condition* upon which the Ruler hath Authority over him in particular (when we ſuppoſe he may otherwiſe be at his own choice): but if a Man ſhall fancy that this Conſent does make a Church or Society, as the *Form* that *Conſtitutes* it, as they muſt do, who ſuppoſe a Society to be *Made*, *Formed*, or *Conſtituted*, by this Conſent without a Head, or the neceſſity of one; it is ſuch a raw, injudicious, indigeſted Conception, as could have never once ſwum in the Thoughts of ſo Learned a Perſon, if he had a faculty for beating out a Notion, ſo good as he has for Books, and negligence toward others that endeavour it.

It is true, there is no Political Society, whether Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, but there muſt be Conſent and Union; but it is not this Conſent, and Union only makes it a Church or Common-Wealth. A Vicinity may have Concord, nay a Herd; and there is Conſent in a Society in *Fieri*, not yet Organiz'd, or Unform'd. There is ſomething that gives the Name and Being, and makes a Society to be that which it is, *in ſpecie* different from others, which is not I ſay Conſent, but it is an Order of Superiority and Inferiority upon Conſent, that does this; and that is all one,

one, as to be the Form that Conſtitutes the Society: And Conſequently, when I find the *Doctor* (being at laſt drawn to it) come to ſuch a Determination as this about the Point, that *There is no neceſſity of a Conſtitutive Head, becauſe a National Conſent makes a National Church*, I muſt pronounce it ſuch a grave Nothing, ſuch a ſpeaking Nothing with Gravity, and pretence of being Wiſer too than his fellows, that if he do not come to be aſhamed before Mr. *Baxter* has done with him, or has reaſon to be ſo, I will be expoſed to ſhame my ſelf for my ſpeaking thus freely, plainly, and honeſtly, as another perſon perhaps would not do.

The truth is, it is pity the *Doctor* did declare his Heart while he was Young againſt the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy, ſeeing he hath occaſion now for another Opinion. Whether out of Prudence or Conſcience, whether for want of more Light then, or more full Light now; it is *God*, and himſelf knows, and I Judge not. But I do perceive this, that it hath expoſed him much, and that not only to ſuch a ſawcy Man as Mr. *Alſop*, to ſtyle him *This Weather-Cock*: but to ſuch a ſerious Man as Mr. *Baxter*, to drive him into ſuch diſtreſs. For ſo long (I muſt ſtill ſay) as the *Doctor* is engaged to hold the Government of Epiſcopacy, as it is exerciſed in the Church of *England*, to be of Divine Right; he muſt

main-

maintain alſo her proper Conſtituting Officers to be of *Chriſts* appointment, and then find out a Conſtitutive Head of it, or he is gone. And ſeeing he cannot do this, but is forced to grant there is no ſuch Head, and that there is no need of any, it is plain that his Cauſe is loſt.

I will ſum up my Anſwer again. The *Doctor's* Determination is, *We deny the neceſſity of any ſuch Regent Part. For a National Conſent is as ſufficient to make a National Church, as an Univerſal Conſent to make a* Catholick *Church.* It is well he ſayes, *As Sufficient*, becauſe, *That* may excuſe him ſomething, if neither of them be Sufficient, as it appears they are not without a Head. I have diſtinguiſhed therefore two Conſents. A Conſent that goes to the *Making* a Society or Church; and a Conſent for coming into the ſame, when it is *Made.* A Conſent that goes to the *Conſtitution*, and a Conſent, that goes to put a Man under the *Adminiſtration.* When the *Doctor* Argues from the *Catholick*, to a *National* Church; that, As an Univerſal Conſent makes the *Catholick* Church: So a National Conſent the National Church; he muſt not be underſtood to mean it of the *Former* Conſent, becauſe there is no ſuch Conſent as that imaginable, in regard to the *Catholick* Church. There can be no coming together poſſibly of the Community of the whole Chriſtian World, to agree

gree to ſuch a Conſtitution. The *Catholick Church* is not made by the conſent of men, but is of God's Ordination altogether. Nor can he be underſtood of the *Latter* conſent, becauſe a conſent to be a Member of a Church or Society already *Made*, is not that conſent which goes to the *Making* it.

A conſent to be a *Chriſtian*, or of the *Church Catholick*, is to conſent to have Chriſt for my Lord and Head. But how a conſent to have Chriſt for ones Head, ſhould prove that *Conſent* makes a Church without a *Head*, is a reaſoning I am yet to underſtand. For the *former conſent*, there is here none of it: And from the *latter*, there can be no Argument.

Again, The *Catholick Church Viſible* in its Nature, can never be Organical. It hath a Head, and all the Particular Churches in the Earth, are the parts of it. Nay, there were at firſt, Univerſal Officers, gifted with proper Gifts, as the Gifts of Tongues, ſutable to ſuch an Office: But theſe were only to gather Particular Churches throughout the World; and it never was the deſigne of the Head, that there ſhould be a Form of Polity introduced into an Oecumenical Society, that by the Organs of Biſhops, Arch-Biſhops, Patriarchs, General Councils, and a Pope, a *Catholick Viſible Government* ſhould be Adminiſtred ſo, as to make the whole Earth a *Political Church*. And conſequently, the Doctors Arguing from the *Catho-*

lick to a *National Church*, cannot be good. Not only because there is no ſuch *Conſtitution* as this by *conſent* imaginable (which I ſhall ſay principally) as to the *Catholick Church* (The True Head of this Church being not *choſen* by Man's *conſent*, and the Falſe Head, I hope, we are never like to *chooſe*): But becauſe, upon ſuppoſition that the Doctors *Conſent* (ſome way or other as he means) did make it, he muſt ſuppoſe this *Univerſal Church*, as ſuch, to be on Earth, a compleat Organized Body, or he muſt make the National Church an In-organical Body; and by either way he drops his *Cauſe*.

I do now wonder therefore at the Doctor, what theſe firſt Apprehenſions of ſomething indeed, he knew not what, in his mind, ſhould mean. How a man, whoſe Parts are ſo great, ſhould be ſo ſlender in his Reaſonings; and why he ſhould undertake the Reſolution of ſuch a Point, as he is no body at, at all.

The Doctor certainly has no reaſon therefore, to inſult over any body, or contemn any, and much leſs to *Pity* Mr. *Baxter*; which *Pity*, by interpretation, is *Slight*. Mr. *Baxter* is a man that is not to be *Pityed*, nor indeed to be *Envied*; for we uſually don't aſpire to be equal to Singular perſons. The Doctor has his Excellencies other ways, but he hath not Mr. *Baxter's*. The Doctor's Soul is made of *Free-ſtone*, you ſhall have from him *Poliſhed Learning*;

Mr.

Mr. *Baxter's* is made of *Flint*, you ſhall have from him *Acute Truth*. It is the Flint, not the Free-ſtone, that ſtrikes *Light*. A quick Apprehenſion; a deep Judgment, a vaſt Invention; Exquiſite Notion. A Pen conſequently, that is but turning the cock, and it will run at any time a Sermon full, or a Book full, as he hath Occaſion. There is a Book I underſtand, of his now ſending out, which hath been many a year in Study (He is uſually too ſudden); it is a Methodical ſyſtem of Divinity, fit for Students at the Univerſity. I believe, that many of our Epiſcopal-Divines will ſpeak lightly of it, but not read it; For my part, through his having this one Chief Work, happily in Latin, I rejoyce from my heart, that Forreign Divines who are not yet Prejudiced, as Ours are, will come to know him. Above all yet, Mr. *Baxter* is a Holy Man, who will be for ever greater in his own *Refuſing* a Biſhoprick, than the Doctor can be in *Getting* one; if the preſent ill managing of this Cauſe does not preclude his having any.

And now, I could not Anſwer it to my ſelf, if I ſhould leave this Diſcourſe without returning to the Matter, to make ſome Improvement of it. From this piece of Doctrine then before (wherein I wonder how the Doctor ſhould ſtumble ſo at noon day)

that the *Church of England* is ſo far *Eraſtian*, that She will not admit of Two *Co-ordinate* Powers with reſpect to the *Church* and the *State* of this Nation, but doth chooſe to Own and Acknowledge the KING to be the only Head of *Both*; we have a Dore open'd for Union, which hath hardly been thought on by any of thoſe Pious and Learned men, whoſe Souls heretofore have ſo much breathed after it.

Archbiſhop *Uſher* hath left us his Model for an Accommodation: And it hath been upon the hearts generally of all Moderate Perſons, that a reduction of ſuch a Government into our Church, as was in in the Primitive Times (when there was a *Conſeſſus Presbyterorum* joyn'd with the Biſhop in all his Acts of Ordination and Juriſdiction) were the Way, and only Effectual Way to our True Happineſs and Reformation. Unto which, if one thing more might be Added, that is, If the Common-Prayer might be new *Caſt* (it being fit, that ſuch a *Veſſel* for the *Sanctuary* ſhould be all of *Pure Gold*) ſo as the whole of it were compoſed of *Scripture-Phraſe* altogether, leaving nothing at all lyable any more to Exception, unleſs the Impoſition of a Form only (which I doubt not but is alſo Juſtifiable by Scripture-Inſtances, as well as Sound Reaſon) it might go near to put an end to all Diſſention among the Sober and Peaceable of the Nation.

It

It is this I know is apt to recur into the Imaginations of Good Men, and forasmuch as there was lately two *Bills* prepared, for *Comprehension* (or Uniting the *Protestants*), and for *Indulgence* (or repealing the Penal Statutes); I shall not I hope incur any blame if I apprehend that such Men who are most considerate, and intent upon the Interest of *God*, in what they seek, do, or did look upon either of such Bills, as no other than an *English Interim*, preparative to this Higher Concord, and Union of the Bishop with his Presbyters, according to the Primitive Pattern mentioned, as soon as more mellow opportunity, and well advised Piety, should administer unto such farther Perfection.

Nevertheless, in regard there is no Uniting of a Nation, can be supposed by any Model, but such as is of *Human* Contrivance; and there are Multitudes of Holy, and Learned Men in this Kingdom, that do believe the way of their Gathered Congregations, is after a higher Pattern, than this of Primitive Episcopacy it self, if there were any hope of the return of it; it is manifest, that there is no Society which is National in *England*, could be formed on these terms, because these Congregational Men can never recede from that which is of *Divine Appointment*, for the sake of any *Antiquity* whatsoever. They do hold *Particular* Churches to be of *Christ's* In-

ſtitution, and *Dioceſan* of *Eccleſiaſtical Conſent* only, and under the Notion of *Divine Right*, it is Sin to them, to Submit to any *Biſhop*.

There is another Notion then, that muſt be advanced to take in theſe Good Men of *This Way*, as well as thoſe of the *Parochial* and *Dioceſan* Way, into one Political Body, for the making up the *National* Church of *England*, whereof the *King* is Head, as I have been ſpeaking: and that is by an Act of Parliament, *Legitimating* theſe *Meetings* of the *Nonconformiſts*, ſo as to become thereby immediately *Parts* of the Church, as *National*, no leſs than the *Parochial* Aſſemblies. It was a good thing in the Houſe of Commons, that they were about to free many Innocent Men, from the danger of the *Penal Statutes*; but the making ſuch Meetings to be *Legal*, is a Deſign of another Nature, of a far greater, nobler, and vaſt Importance.

The Nonconformiſt as well as Conformiſt, The Congregationaliſt as well as the Presbyterian, do acknowledg the *King*'s Supremacy, and can take the Oath. The one, as well as the other, therefore do own an External Regiment of the Magiſtrate over their Churches, ſo as to be puniſhable by him, for any neglect of the Goſpel Order, which themſelves profeſs; or for any Rules they make, or Things they do, which are repugnant to the Peace of the Kingdom.

If

If it ſhall pleaſe the *King* conſequently, to commit any part of that Authority of his, which he hath *Circa Sacra*, to be exerciſed by the Biſhops, as Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrates under him, they can ſubmit to a Viſitation under them, upon that account: though they acknowledge them not to be *Chriſts* Officers, bearing, or having any *Internal* Church-Power from him, over them, or any other, but their own Charge.

Upon which account it appears further, how the outward Dignity, and Grandeur of the Biſhop need not be Diminiſhed, but enhaunced; and his Superintendency extended over the *Congregational*, as well as the *Parochial* Churches: Provided only, he will but keep within his Line; that is the Line of the *King*, and meddle not with *Chriſt's* Juriſdiction. Neither will they envy him his Barony, and ſitting in the Parliament.

And if it ſhould ſeem farther good here to a Parliament in one and the ſame Act, that Legitimates ſuch Meetings, to appoint that unto the two *Clerks*, which are Elected by the Miniſters of every Dioceſs; there ſhould be one more choſe by the *Congregationaliſts*, likewiſe, for every Convocation; to joyn with them in Conſultation, that ſuch Canons, and ſuch only may be framed, as tend to the propagation of *Holineſs* and *Peace*, throughout all the Churches,

ches, as well *Congregational* as *Parochial*; who does not ſee, how by this means, one *Organ* more ſhould be added to this great *Political* Society, for deriving an influence from this Head, to theſe Parts of the Body, as well as others, which now ſeem neglected, and to have no care taken of them.

And this brings into my mind, a Text of the Apoſtle. *God hath tempered the Body together, having given abundant Honour to that part which lacked: That there ſhould be no Schiſme in the Body, but that the Members ſhould have the ſame care of one another.* From which Text (if I may go a little about, to come the nearer home) we may underſtand where the *Core* of that *Evil* we call *Schiſme*, does lye; and that is mainly in the *Want* of that *Love*, and that *Care* which the Members owe one to another. It will follow, that whoſoever they be, whether *Conformiſt* or *Nonconformiſt*, who do care leaſt for the Concord, and Edification of the whole Body; thoſe are like to be found moſt Guilty of that Sin in the Sight of *God*.

The Nonconformiſt Miniſter does often come to the Pariſh Church, but the Conformiſt Miniſter comes never to his Meeting; and, Which then of the Two, is the greater Separatiſt?

The Meetings of the one, and of the other, as they are *Particular* Churches, are Churches of *Chriſt*, and *Parts* of the *Univerſal*, and ſo of *Divine*, though

through *Quatenus Parochial*, of *Human* Inſtitution. They both agree in the ſame *Doctrine*, and the ſame *Sacraments*. They have one *God*, one *Hope* of our Calling, one *Lord*, one *Faith*, one *Baptiſm*. They differ ſomthing indeed in Opinion about the Church, as to the external Conſtitution, and Diſcipline of it, and about ſome Rites and Practices, which makes them go into diſtinct Congregations. But is their going only to two Meetings enough to make Both, or Either of them, to be Guilty of this Sin of Schiſme?

Separation I take it, in its ſelf, ſimply conſidered, is neither Good nor Evil; and there muſt be ſomething that makes ſuch a Separation to be Sinful, or elſe it is not to be accounted Schiſme. If a Man ſhall Separate from the Pariſh Church, upon the perſwaſion that thoſe Churches are no true Churches, I take ſuch a Separation to be a high breach of Charity, which muſt therefore render it Sinful, and Conſequently Schiſme. If any ſhall Separate out of Pride, Contention, or any the like *Sinful Cauſe*, or to any *Sinful End*, as Worldly *Gain* (for to ſome, *Gain* is *Godlineſs*), or *Vain Glory*: this will make ſuch a Separation to be ſtill Sinful, and ſo Schiſme.

It were the part then of ſuch a *Convocation* before mentioned, that is, of Miniſters conſiſting of both

ſorts, to be ſure to agree upon this, That, Neither Church (or any Members of Either) ſhall Unchurch one another: and, That no Man ſhould depart from the *One* Church to the *Other*, but upon a ſufficient peaceable Reaſon, under the pain of Eccleſiaſtical Cenſure.

They ſhould not permit any perſon unlearned, till come to very grave Years (which are paſt Heat and Oſtentation) to Exerciſe in theſe Meetings: They ſhould decree the Doors of ſuch Meetings to be kept open, that the Magiſtrate may be ſecure againſt Sedition.

They ſhould determine many things of ſuch a Nature; but eſpecially, that when a Man hath his choice to be of what Congregation he will, in regard to *Fixed Communion*, as he finds it moſt conducive to his Souls Edification; yet ſhould he be allowed, and enjoyned to come *Occaſionally* alſo to the *Pariſh* Meetings (ſo far as he can in point of Conſcience), for the teſtifying his Union with the Body, as the *Church* is *National* in this Kingdom. And I would have perſons likewiſe, who come for their Stated Worſhip to the *Pariſh Church*, to go ſometimes to the *Meetings* alſo without ſcruple, by the way of *Occaſional Communion*.

I will here deliver my own Soul. I know that the *Laws* of the *Magiſtrate* that are *Good*, do *Bind* the *Conſci-*

Conſcience: but there are two Caſes that *Looſe* a Man from *Obedience*. One is, When that which is Commanded, is againſt his Conſcience: and the Other is, When that which is Commanded, is Superſeded by a Duty of greater concernment. I cannot ſay for my part, that to go to Church, and hear Common-Prayer, is againſt my Conſcience; though a thorough Conformity in all things, on the Miniſters part, is like ſtill to be ſo; ſeeing the *Doctor* himſelf does ſhrink from a Defence of the Lawfulneſs of *That*: but this I can ſay, that when it is my duty to go to *Church*, and my duty alſo to go *Preach* (ſuppoſing I am called to one of theſe Meetings), the leaving undone that Duty, which is the *Leſs*, for the doing the *Other* that can't be done otherwiſe, is no Sin, or Evil, as I am perſwaded in my Judgment. And it is upon the Plea of the *Greater Duty*, that the *Peaceable Deſign* does ſtand.

I know well how my Brethren ſtate *Their* Caſe, They will have going to *Their Meetings*, to be for their *Fixed Communion*; and allow *Occaſional Communion* with the *Pariſh Church*, to defend themſelves from Schiſme: but I, for my part muſt confeſs, that I ſee not, and cannot ſee my *Defence* to be ſo *Safe*, unleſs I take the *Pariſh* Aſſembly (where I have convenience) for my *Fixed* Communion, and my *Preaching* in the *Meetings*, and the Peoples going to them, to

be *Occaſional* only, for our *Greater* or *Farther* Edification. The *Doctor* therefore ſhould indeed have taken particular Notice of this, and Providing only againſt ſuch Preaching to be at that time, when Publick Authority requires the General Attendance otherwhere, he ſhould, by giving an Approbation to ſuch a State of *Our* Cauſe, have conſulted his *Own*, both with more Judgment, and with more Moderation, then for ought I ſee he hath done, or was able to do.

Indeed if the Scene were altered, I need not be ſo wary. If theſe *Separate Aſſemblies* were made *Legal*, the Schiſme preſently, in reference to the National Church were at an End. *Schiſme is a Separation from that Church, whereof we ought, or are bound to be Members: If the Supreme Authority then looſe our Obligation to the Pariſh Meeting, ſo that we are bound no longer, the* Iniquity *upon that account, is not to be* Found, *and the Schiſme gone.* It is one Act of Parliament would give a full Anſwer, to all Mens Arguments.

In the mean time, the Non-conformiſts I know, have *other* Pleas beſides *One* for what they do. They think themſelves bound in Conſcience to *Meet*, and *Preach*, and account it *Serving God*, and *Doing* their *Duty*. The Doctor and others call it *Sin* and *Wickedneſs*. When I Hear ſuch Sayings therefore, and Read ſuch Books, I may ſtill bear Reverence to the Perſons,

ſons, but I do not in my Heart, care one Penny for what they ſay; for, there is a *Conſcience within* quite above ſuch *Words*. They may cry, This is Schiſm; *There never was ſuch Horrible Schiſm, as this Practiſe, heard of, before in the Chriſtian World* ſayes one very ſerious Author, whom I name not: but I am not moved for all that. I cannot think a *Nonconformiſt Meeting* ſuch a *Horrible Creature* (conſidering how our caſe in *England* now ſtands) as theſe Church-Men generally would make it. *The great Bear* (I muſt count ſtill) *hath been lead ſo long about the Streets, that the very Children are no longer afraid of it.*

Not but I am ſenſible of the dangerous conſequence into which our Diviſions may bring us; but who can help it? Who is the *Cauſe* of them? *Who is in Fault*, is the Queſtion. Who is it can Remedy theſe Terms impoſed on us as neceſſary to Communion? The *Nonconformiſt* hath no Conſcience of Sin upon him in the thing; and if he cannot have Peace with his Brethren of the *Church*, upon any terms but *Full Conforming*, it is God muſt be the Judg, and the *Biſhop* and *Presbyterian*, the *Doctor* and Mr. *Baxter*, ſhall know which of them it is, that are to Blame at the Great Day. And *wherefore then were ye not afraid to ſpeak againſt my ſervant* Moſes?

The Doctor had no *Need* to lay out his Parts upon ſuch a Deſign as that he hath under his hands:

Nor has he *Reaſon* (I muſt inculcate) to *Deſpiſe* or *Scorn*, no nor to *Slight*, or *Neglect* any body, though the *Meaneſt* perſon.

There is a late Reverend Conformiſt (for ſo I take him to be) who in a certain Book, Entituled, *Liberty of Conſcience, in its order to Univerſal Peace*, hath deſerved better of us. *I ſuppoſe* (ſayes he) *there is a Society, or Societies of Chriſtians, that hold Chriſt the Head, and the great points of Union; but refuſe to Joyn in ſuch Opinion or Practiſe, as they conceive not Allowable by the Word of God; nor can they, that require their Compliance, pretend on their part, that the things are Abſolute Neceſſary to make a Member of the Body of Chriſt: In this caſe, I ſay, he is only the Schiſmatick that hath not a Love, that hath no Sympathy with the Body; and therefore, if neither hath, they muſt be both Schiſmaticks.* I ſhould not fill ſo much room with a Quotation, but that I am taken with the *Genius* of the Writer. He is a man quite Unknown to me, but he hath a fine Spirit, and his Book ſavours of it: That is, ſo Generous, ſo Candid, ſo Benign towards the Diſſenters; as the temper is quite contrary, in the Authors, of the *Friendly Debate*, the *Eccleſiaſtical Polity*, and the *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation.*

I am concern'd, I muſt needs ſay, that I put theſe three Names together; Not that the Authors of either of the firſt Books, are men of leſs bright Parts, or that

that the Books have leſs Excellency of their kind, in them, than the laſt, but becauſe of the reaſon, why I do it. For I muſt confeſs, it is a matter of real Offence to me, that a man who is ſo *Learned* a man, ſo *Honoured* a man throughout the Nation, ſhould prove a *Proud* man, a *Diſdainful*, *Contemptuous* perſon; Which Temper, if it be Indulged, is ſo un-endurable by God and Man, that it will hurl any one into the duſt: And I cannot do any better Service in the Earth to this otherwiſe very Worthy and Excellent *Doctor*, than to contribute the beſt I can to my utmoſt, for bringing him to ſome Ingenuous Senſe and Amendment of it. And ſo I leave him to the World, to judg who is moſt fit to be *Pityed*, the *Doctor* himſelf, or Mr. *Baxter*. *Thou ſhalt not Hate thy Brother in thy Heart, but thou ſhalt in any wiſe Rebuke him, and not ſuffer Sin upon him.*

THE END.

ERRATA.

PAge 8. Line 11. in ſome of the Copies the word *Laſt* is put for *Firſt*. p. 26. l. 3. for *ſhall* read *ſtill*. p. 27. l. 18. for *own* read *once*.